



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

polemic against Gnosticism for that atmosphere and spirit is all but entirely wanting. Nor is it directed against a John-the-Baptist cult for no reference that can be so interpreted is to be found after the third chapter. It is the Judaism of his own time against which the Evangelist directs his argument. The questions discussed in the gospel are not those with which Jesus had to deal in his conflict with Judaism, but they belong to the Judaism which was contemporary with the Evangelist. The differences between the gospel and the First Epistle are such as to indicate a period of time intervening if not a difference of authorship. The balance of evidence is against the priority of the epistle. The first (as well as the second and third epistles which belong together in purpose and time), is an antidocetic polemic.

In reference to the Apocalypse the work of Gunkel is recognized as of great value. He has given strong emphasis to the fact that for a proper study of the Apocalypse the history of religion must be supplemented by a careful study of political and literary history. The partition hypothesis has been successfully opposed. The Apocalypse is a work of art from beginning to end and not at all a loose compilation. Its relation to the other apocalyptic writings is still an open question. But it is at any rate folly to exempt it from the principles which control the interpretation of apocalypses in general. It is not an understanding of modern history, but rather acquaintance with the history of thought and life antecedent to and contemporary with the Apocalypse that gives us the key to its interpretation. The effort to find in it a description of modern situations and movements is rightly and sufficiently characterized as "wild exegesis." The section on the history of the interpretation of the Apocalypse is informing and useful.

The revision has been intrusted to capable hands. The volume has been improved in many ways. The mechanical features have been made more acceptable to English eyes. Even in so minor a matter as the arrangement of bibliography this is apparent. Bauer has brought the book up to date and greatly enhanced the value of an already useful work.

J. W. BAILEY

OSHKOSH, WIS.

#### RELATION OF THE APOSTLE PETER TO ROME

The aim of Professor Guignebert's book,<sup>1</sup> which is to test the solidity of the Roman claims regarding Peter, may well have an interest in his French environment that it hardly has in ours. In our Protestant world

<sup>1</sup> *La primauté de Pierre et la venue de Pierre à Rome. Etude critique* par Ch. Guignebert, Chargé de Cours d'histoire ancienne du Christianisme à l'Université de Paris. Paris: Nourry, 1909. xvi + 379 pages. Fr. 6.

of thought the primacy of Peter and his relation to Rome are questions which are regarded as settled. We do not deny that more may be said, that certain details are still open to discussion; but there is perhaps a feeling that no more *need* be said on the fundamental issues. It is doubtless true, as the author says, that the literature of the subject has been very largely dominated by theological and polemical interests, and hence, as far as scientific results are concerned, may be ignored. This criticism is sure to be made on his own work, however unjustly, by those who see that it destroys what they have always believed to be fundamental, and on which their entire ecclesiastical system rests. The more fair-minded, however, of the Roman confession will admit that the author has at least avoided extremes of partisanship and that he has made an honest attempt to follow a strictly historical method. It is difficult indeed to see how any intelligent Catholic could read the argument without assenting to the author's conclusions so far at least as to concede that the foundations of the papacy, so far as Scripture and tradition are concerned, are not beyond question.

The results of Professor Guignebert's investigations are in the main those which have been widely held by recent Protestant scholars. To say this is of course by no means to dismiss the book as without a value of its own. It has at least the value of an independent and weighty confirmation of many of those results. But it has more than this. There are points at which it is likely to modify the prevailing views. Thus, e.g., the author is not content with a demonstration of the incorrectness of the Catholic interpretation of Matt. 16:18, 19. His point of attack is the genuineness and authenticity of the passage. He holds with some recent text-critics that it is a late addition to the gospel. He discusses the significance of its absence from Mark and Luke, and makes a forcible argument against its being from Jesus on the basis of seven New Testament texts (Matt. 18:18; 20:20; John 20:23; Gal., chap. 2; I Cor. 3:10, 11; Eph. 2:20; Apoc. 21:14). While confident that the words are not from Jesus, he admits the difficulty of accounting for their introduction into the gospel. He inclines to regard the passage as having originated at a time when Paul was exalted as the one faithful apostle (so by Marcion), and to be in spirit anti-Pauline though formally using Pauline terminology ("building" and "church"). The view that a genuine word of Jesus, expressive of confidence in Peter, underlies the passage is not looked on with favor.

Again, Professor Guignebert departs from the current view of Peter's connection with Rome. For he holds that not even Peter's death, not to mention his recognized headship of the Roman church or a twenty-five years' sojourn in Rome, has the support of a single trustworthy text. The patris-

tic testimony is vague, the reasons advanced are unsettled. The Roman view is only a hypothesis.

But these illustrations of the more personal element in Professor Guignebert's book must suffice.

In concluding this brief review I quote from the author's *Avant-propos* a sentence whose truth needs frequent recognition: "Je crois fermement, et de plus en plus, que suivant, sans y prendre assez garde, la tendance naturelle, indispensable même, aux confessionnels et surtout aux catholiques, nous majorons beaucoup trop nos connaissances sur nombre de questions chrétiennes; nous ne savons pas assez nous résoudre à ignorer ce que pourtant les textes ne nous disent pas."

GEORGE HOLLEY GILBERT

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

---

### SOME MATTERS OF THE CHRISTIAN CENTURIES

Every student of mediaeval history or literature should feel himself a debtor to the editors of this work.<sup>1</sup> The *De contemptu mundi* of Bernard of Cluny is one of the most valuable sources we possess for the ascetic interpretation of feudal society in the twelfth century. Written in dactylic rhymed hexameter, the poem has a certain moral kinship with Hesiod's *Works and Days* and Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*—the pithy, sententious, moral observation of the former; the detachedness and lofty scorn of the latter, though of course shot through and through with the morbidly ascetic ideas of the Middle Ages and tinted with that cloistered radiance that never shone on sea or land.

To the scholar whose mind is steeped in the lore of things long ago, these pages are luminous. There is something romantic yet Spartan in the vision of the Elysian brightness of the adorned earth in the Golden Age of the race (Book II, 129-32). There are vivid pictures of mediaeval society—the feudal strife that recalls the Truce of God; the fighting cleric; the warrior abbot; the sleek, well-fed bishop, "a fatted fowl filling the useless sepulchre of his belly," going forth to hunt of a morning, mounted upon a Spanish barb, with a pack of hunting dogs better fed than the peasants (160-61). The corruption of Rome and the papal curia is visited with scathing censure (164-67). But though the clergy comes in for bitterest scorn no class of mediaeval society escapes. The bailiff "who judges

<sup>1</sup> *The Source of "Jerusalem the Golden."* Together with Other Pieces Attributed to Bernard of Cluny. In English Translation by Henry Preble. Introduction, Notes, and Annotated Bibliography by Samuel Macauley Jackson. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1910. vi+207 pages. \$1.38.